REMARKS

1.   Status of Claims

Claims 1 – 25, 29, 39 and 40 were previously cancelled. Claims 26 – 28, 30 – 38, 40 –

48, and 50 - 58 are pending. Claims 26, 36, and 46 are amended herein. These amendments are

supported throughout the specification. No new matter has been added with these amendments.

All amendments presented herein are made solely to expedite prosecution of the

application without admission as to the propriety of the rejections set forth in the Office Action

and without acquiescence to the Examiner's characterization of the claims or the art cited herein.

Applicants respectfully reserve the right to include claims of the same or different scope as

previously written in one or more continuing applications.

2.   Claim Rejections

Claims 26-33, 36-43, 46-53 and 56 – 58 stand rejected as being unpatentable under 35

U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0033212 to Sandhu ("Sandhu") in view of U.S.

Patent No. 7,024,462 to McErlean ("McErlean"). Claims 34, 35, 44, 45, 54, and 55 stand

rejected as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Sandhu in view of McErlean and

Official Notice. Applicants respectfully traverse for at least the following reasons.

Claim 26, as amended, requires one or more client devices operable to receive *by way of*

entry into an interface information concerning one or more deals, the one or more deals each

comprising a financial transaction *that has been agreed to by a party and a counterparty when*

the information concerning the one or more deals is entered into the interface. Similarly, claims

36 and 46, as amended, each require receiving from one or more client devices information

concerning one or more deals, the received information being *entered by one or more users into*

an interface displayed by the client devices, wherein the one or more deals each comprise a

financial transaction *that has been agreed to by a party and a counterparty when the information*

concerning the one or more deals is entered into the interface.

Sandhu does not disclose, at least, these limitations. Sandhu discloses interfaces that

receive information regarding *price requests* and *price quotes* (see, e.g., Sandhu, paras. [0197],

[0985]), not *deals comprising a financial transaction that has been agreed to by a party and a*

counterparty when the information concerning the one or more deals is entered into the

interface, as claimed. While Sandhu makes reference to the fact that the party making the price

request and the party making the price quote may indeed reach an agreement at some later point

(e.g., Sandhu, para. [0197]), Sandhu does not disclose *any interface for capturing information*

regarding such transactions that are agreed upon when the information concerning the one or

more details is entered into the interface, as required by claims 26 and 36.

The Examiner indicates, in his response to Applicants' arguments made in their prior

response, that the phrase "a financial transaction that has been agreed to by a party and a

counterparty" is "extraordinarily broad" and could encompass a price offer that that identifies the

sender (party) and the recipient (counterparty) and the product type (price offer for specified

financial product). The Examiner goes on to reason that "[s]olicitation of a price offer and

response from the sender to the recipient shows the sender['']s agreement to be bound by his

transmitted offer." Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner that the phrase "a

financial transaction that has been agreed to by a party and a counterparty" is broad enough to

cover a price request or a price quote. A price request (or a price quote) is just one side of a transaction and, thus, nothing is agreed upon at the time the request (or quote) is made and entered into the interface. Indeed, the Examiner's comments emphasize this point when he states that both an offer and a response are required in order for there to be agreement.

McErlean does not make up for the deficiency in Sandhu in this regard and, thus, claims 26, 36 and 46 are patentable over Sandhu and McErlean, alone or in combination.

Dependent claims 27, 28, 30 – 35 and 56 depend from independent claim 26, thereby incorporating all the features of this base claim. Dependent claims 37, 38, 40 – 45 and 57 depend from independent claim 36, thereby incorporating all the features of this base claim. Dependent claims 47, 48, 50 – 55 and 58 depend from independent claim 46, thereby incorporating all the features of this base claim. Accordingly, Applicants submit Sandhu and McErlean, alone or in combination, fail to teach the features of these dependent claims for at least the reasons discussed above. Further, Sandhu and McErlean fail to disclose the specific elements required by the dependent claims, an example of which is set forth below.

Each of claims 56, 57 and 58 require that the information is routed to at least one of the plurality of internal systems, *each of the plurality of internal systems being configured to process a designated product type*. Neither Sandhu nor McErlean disclose this feature. In the Office Action, the Examiner appears not to apply Sandhu and McErlean to the language appearing in these claims. In particular, the Examiner states that Sandhu discloses "each of the internal systems being associated with one or more product types." Such language does not appear in the claims. If in his next action the Examiner asserts that Sandhu discloses the language that is

actually presented in claims 56, 57 and 58 (i.e., "each of the plurality of internal systems being configured to process a designated product type"), Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's next such action should *not be made final*, as Applicants have not been given the opportunity to respond to the Examiner's position on this claim language in response to the presently outstanding Office Action.

Indeed, as set forth in Applicants' last response, Sandhu does not disclose "each of the plurality of internal systems being configured to process a designated product type." Sandhu states in paragraph [0930]:

> The functionality provided by the present embodiment of this invention enables user to conduct interactive and automated financial transactions in capital markets. The types of transactions that may be conducted are described above. The functionality and interactive user interfaces that support the creation and execution of such transactions enable users to engage in pre-transaction, transaction, and post-transaction activities. Note that the functionality and interfaces described in this embodiment could be combined with other functionality and interfaces, or certain of such functionality and interfaces (or portions thereof) could be isolated in separate systems, in various other embodiments of this invention. The system can be implemented as a stand-alone central system or as a distributed system, with separate versions of the functionality and interfaces distributed to multiple user platforms or portals. In other embodiments, portions of the system functionality and interfaces could be divided into separate systems (e.g., a transaction structuring system, a price quote system, a transaction acceptance system) with communication links that enable the different systems to exchange data. Other embodiments will be apparent to and could be implemented by practitioners skilled in this art.

Thus, Sandhu describes that its system may be implemented (1) as a stand-alone central system; (2) as a distributed system, with separate versions of the functionality and interfaces distributed to multiple user platforms or portals; or (3) by dividing the functionality and interfaces into separate systems. As to embodiment (3) of Sandhu, Sandhu makes clear that, by referring to use of separate systems for "functionality and interfaces", it is referring to the various

tasks that are undertaken by the system and not *product types* that could be handled by the system. In particular, Sandhu uses the term "functionality", which does not in any way refer to product types, and, further, Sandhu provides examples of the "functionality" to which it refers ("e.g., a transaction structuring system, a price quote system, a transaction acceptance system"). Thus, Sandhu neither teaches nor suggests that each of the plurality of internal systems is configured to process a designated product type as required by the claims. McErlean does not make up for this deficiency.

The Examiner's comments on pages 7 and 8 of the Office Action appear to relate to claim language that no longer appears in the claims and, thus, the Applicants have not responded to these sections.

For at least the above-cited reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable over the cited art.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

Please charge any fees due in connection with the filing of this response to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Dated: May 27, 2011

By: ___ /Alison B. Weisberg/
Alison B. Weisberg
Reg. No. 45,206

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
Customer No.: 28977
1701 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19003
Telephone: 215.963.5091